

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,508	08/16/2000	Richard S. Chomik	460.1891USV	3194
75	90 09/01/2004		EXAM	INER
Charles N.J. Ruggiero Esq			DEXTER, CLARK F	
OHLANDT GR	EELEY RUGGIERO	& PERLE LLP		
One Landmark	Square		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Stamford, CT	-		3724	

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	,
	09/639,508	CHOMIK ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Clark F. Dexter	3724	
The MAILING DATE of this comn Period for Reply	nunication appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMM - Extensions of time may be available under the provis after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this of - If the period for reply specified above is less than thir If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximu - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply set or extended	UNICATION. ions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may communication. ty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of the statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) Moreply will, by statute, cause the application to become this after the mailing date of this communication, even	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s)	filed on 24 May 2004.		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL .	2b)☐ This action is non-final.		
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ion for allowance except for formal ma actice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C		
Disposition of Claims			
5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>14-16</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) <u>18-20 and 24-26</u> is/are contained.	23 and 27-40 is/are withdrawn from co	nsideration.	
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by	the Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/a	are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected t	o by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any o	bjection to the drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) included the state of the st		ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
	u to by the Examiner. Note the attach	ed Omçe Action of form 1 10-132.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
2. Certified copies of the prior3. Copies of the certified copiesapplication from the Internal		Application No en received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		v Summary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Reviews Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-144 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on May 24, 2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Greenwood et al., pn 5,499,729.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 18-20 and 24-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed May 24, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is respectfully submitted that Greenwood discloses and/or suggests the invention to the extent claimed. While applicant has made a geometric dissection of Figure 17 to illustrate that the one and only centerline of aperture 73 in Greenwood is not coincident to the radius that forms the concave curvature of the domed portion, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner cannot rely on such an analysis for

Application/Control Number: 09/639,508

Art Unit: 3724

patentability. First, as applicant is well aware, unless stated so in the patent, the drawings cannot be considered as being drawn to scale. It has been held that:

"When the reference does not disclose that the drawings are to scale and is silent as to dimensions, arguments based on measurement of the drawing features are of little value. See Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Group Int 'I, 222 F.3d 951, 956, 55 USPQ2d 1487, 1491 (Fed. Cir. 2000)." See MPEP 2125.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that applicant's analysis using the angles shown in the drawings, particularly Figure 17, is based on drawings of a patent that does not state or suggest that they are drawn to any scale using the exact dimensions, angles, etc. Rather, the drawings must be considered for what they teach or suggest to one having ordinary skill in the art. In Figure 17 of Greenwood, it is respectfully submitted that aperture 73 appears to extend from the apex of recess 74, and appears to extend to the outer surface of diaphragm 72, and appears to intersect that surface at an angle of about 90 degrees to a tangent of the surface at the point of intersection. Thus, it appears to meet the claimed limitations. Further, it is respectfully submitted that whether the apertures are formed by hand or by an apparatus appears to be irrelevant with respect to the location and orientation of the apertures.

Second, it is noted that based on the declarations submitted by applicant, it appears that the criticality of the invention lies in the subject matter of claims 18-20 and 24-26. That is, the combination of a depression and a perforation, wherein the perforation is in the form of a slit.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark F. Dexter whose telephone number is (703)308-1404. The examiner can be reached Monday through Friday during normal business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan N. Shoap can be reached on (703)308-1082. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/639,508 Page 5

Art Unit: 3724

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Clark F. Dexter
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3724

cfd

August 31, 2004